

Message

---

**From:** Donaldson, Guy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D2A0969773664CC3B6EB1208748F1A5D-DONALDSON, GUY]  
**Sent:** 8/21/2018 1:40:26 PM  
**To:** Parker, Cindy [parker.cindy@epa.gov]; Verhalen, Frances [verhalen.frances@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Smith, Darcie [Smith.Darcie@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: ERRATA Change: can we have a pow-wow about NMED, pls?

Building on Fran's talking points, how about these for NMED

- The NATA map highlights any metropolitan statistical area (MSA) that has a census tract where risks are estimated to be elevated.
- This does not mean the risks are elevated throughout the MSA.
- The elevated risk associated with the Las Cruces MSA results from elevated risk for a single Census tract in the Santa Teresa area.
- This Census tract contains a source of ethylene oxide, Sterigenics.
- While the NATA estimates do not have sufficient resolution to estimate the risk on a smaller than Census block scale, we note that the facility is not in close proximity to residential areas.
- importantly the Sterigenics facility has put in pollution control equipment that have reduced its emissions by 83% since the 2014 NATA estimate which is expected to address the elevated risk.

---

**From:** Parker, Cindy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 21, 2018 8:09 AM  
**To:** Verhalen, Frances <verhalen.frances@epa.gov>; Donaldson, Guy <Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: ERRATA Change: can we have a pow-wow about NMED, pls?

When I spoke with Liz Kuehn yesterday, she wanted to know why she had an EPA email (from Josh and I) that Sterigenics wasn't a concern – it was not at the time, it's an old email – and then suddenly the second largest city in the state pops red, and the Sterigenics facility is 30 mi away. She questioned the MSA, and including Las Cruces in the Sterigenics area, meaning that the population of Las Cruces was at risk. And we had told her not to worry about Sterigenics. She had already spoken to Fran when she called me. I sent her to Darcie.

I don't know that we can change the MSA designation, but maybe some talking points to help them out?

---

**From:** Verhalen, Frances  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 21, 2018 8:01 AM  
**To:** Donaldson, Guy <Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov>; Parker, Cindy <parker.cindy@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** ERRATA Change: can we have a pow-wow about NMED, pls?

- NATA map is located at the metropolitan statistical area (MSA) locale. Thus a facility in Santa Teresa is associated with the Las Cruces MSA.
- The assessment is for a specific area within the MSA. In this case, the elevated risk is associated with a facility in Santa Teresa.
- The facility in Santa Teresa shows modeled risk for residents to the west at approximately 1 mile. There may be a school in this area.
- EPA has added a notation to the MAP APP for Santa Teresa that indicates that the emissions are based on information from the 2014 EI or TRI and that these emissions have changed after the 2014 EI or TRI was submitted.

Frances Verhalen, P.E., Chief

Air Monitoring/Grants Section  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
1445 Ross Avenue (MC 6MM-AM)  
Dallas, TX 75202  
214-665-2172  
[verhalen.frances@epa.gov](mailto:verhalen.frances@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Verhalen, Frances

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 21, 2018 8:01 AM

**To:** Donaldson, Guy <[Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov](mailto:Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov)>; Parker, Cindy <[parker.cindy@epa.gov](mailto:parker.cindy@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: can we have a pow-wow about NMED, pls?

- NATA map is located at the metropolitan statistical area (MSA) locale. Thus a facility in Santa Teresa is associated with the Las Cruces MSA.
- The assessment is for a specific area within the MSA. In this case, the elevated risk is associated with a facility in Santa Teresa.
- The facility in Santa Teresa shows modeled risk for residents to the west at approximately 1 mile. There is a school in this area.
- EPA has added a notation to the MAP APP for Santa Teresa that indicates that the emissions are based on information from the 2014 EI or TRI and that these emissions have changed after the 2014 EI or TRI was submitted.

Frances Verhalen, P.E., Chief  
Air Monitoring/Grants Section  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
1445 Ross Avenue (MC 6MM-AM)  
Dallas, TX 75202  
214-665-2172  
[verhalen.frances@epa.gov](mailto:verhalen.frances@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Donaldson, Guy

**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2018 4:14 PM

**To:** Parker, Cindy <[parker.cindy@epa.gov](mailto:parker.cindy@epa.gov)>; Verhalen, Frances <[verhalen.frances@epa.gov](mailto:verhalen.frances@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: can we have a pow-wow about NMED, pls?

I'm not sure what else we can share at this point that we haven't already.

---

**From:** Parker, Cindy

**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2018 3:29 PM

**To:** Verhalen, Frances <[verhalen.frances@epa.gov](mailto:verhalen.frances@epa.gov)>; Donaldson, Guy <[Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov](mailto:Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** can we have a pow-wow about NMED, pls?

I think we need to offer more details and explanations about the latter part of the process, what to expect, etc. So far today, I have talked with both Roslyn and Liz Kuehn, and they are both still seeking more information.

*Cindy K. Parker*

US EPA Region 6, 6MM-AM  
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200  
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733  
Phone 214.665.7291